CACC MEETING MINUTES

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, September 22, 2016
10:00 AM - 11:15 AM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-452-3288
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 92216#

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT
Kip Anderson*	Christopher Hale
Cathy Clarich *(Rebecca Steele, proxy)*	Rona Newton
Julie Dybas	Jeff Mangis
Donald Jacobson	Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Phillip Knox	Paul Thomas
Ron Overholt*	
Janie Randall*	

GUESTS	AOC STAFF
Alexis Allen, *Tempe Municipal Court*	Heather Barton, *ITD*
Jennifer Gilbertson*, *Phoenix Municipal Court*	Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
	Michelle Gillich, *ITD*
	Adele May, *ITD*
	Jim Price, *ITD*

** **indicates appeared by telephone***

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS
Acting Chair Don Jacobson, substituting for Judge Michael Pollard, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order just after 10:00 a.m. He explained to members in the room and on the phone that a COJET event competing with today's meeting required the attendance of several project managers on the agenda. He also deferred consideration of the minutes until a documented quorum existed.

OCTOBER 20 REVIEW UDPATE
Staff Member Stewart Bruner briefed members on progress in response to direction provided in the August CACC meeting. Following revisitation of project monitoring provisions and CACC's charter in ACJA 1-109 as well as a meeting between the chair and Karl Heckart, an approach is underway to map major projects in all trial courts to the COT priority categories along with an effort to define "major." Hundreds of automation projects exist around the state– too many to review in a single meeting, so Stewart drafted a mapping table that reduces the number to 25 for members' input. He defined "major" projects as being critical to the court, or having a statewide integration component to them, or using resources that are also necessary for a statewide project or integration effort. In answer to a question, Stewart reviewed the status of each project appearing on COT's committed project list from the annual meeting. He proposed a slower progression through the projects than originally discussed at the August CACC meeting.

Don Jacobson countered the perspective that CACC should monitor all trial court projects. He expressed confidence in COT and staff to refer specific items to be actively monitored, based on review of IT strategic plans. Since no formal process exists, members discussed various criteria that could be used to determine a threshold for a project that requires monitoring. Following the posting of the various materials discussed today, the October meeting will entertain more discussion about the specific approach to take, rather than beginning the roundup of projects as discussed last month.

After confirming that a quorum finally existed, Don asked for a motion regarding the minutes of the August 18 meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the August 18, 2016 CACC meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously.

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO MINDMAP THIS MONTH
Stewart detailed various changes made on the MindMap since the August meeting, passing along what information he had received from project managers in light of the conflict with the COJET session today. Members were provided the usual updated priority projects listing for reference.

SPECIAL REPORT: LPOR/CPOR COURT FEEDS
In response to discussion that took place following the August CACC meeting, Stewart elaborated on the present state of affairs with automated reporting of protective orders for the two statewide case management systems in use by courts. AZTEC continues automated feeds while AJACS 3.9 relies on input to DPS by sheriffs' offices through their local records management systems or by manual entry. AJACS 6.0 contains a new automated interface which is currently being tested at the AOC. He also shared the specifics of a special situation that exists

in Coconino County with non-automated reporting. Members expressed concern that other counties might be experiencing the same issues as Coconino without the awareness of the clerk and court administrator. It is a public safety issue. Don provided names of Coconino law enforcement representatives to be contacted about resolving the reporting issue with DPS. He recommended that general jurisdiction clerks, court administrators, and sheriffs around the state as well as the limited jurisdiction (LJ) courts in Pima County be alerted to ensure protective order entries are being made in the DPS system.

PROJECT UPDATE: eUNIVERSA eFILING AND OTHER ePROJECTS

Jim Price, product manager for eUniversa e-filing, informed members that two electronic filings have recently processed successfully in the Yavapai Superior Court pilot. He shared the resolutions to business process issues exposed in the pilot as well as a couple of automation changes that must be completed before full production mode is declared. In response to a question about the way results and learnings from the pilot will be shared Jim offered to provide regular updates to CACC on an ongoing basis. He also provided a brief update on the progress of the e-charging prototype for criminal e-filing to eventual work with eUniversa.

PROJECT UPDATE: CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Adele May, the LJ CMS project manager, provided a progress update on Pinal county LJ courts that are being implemented this week. She described a speedier, new "3-2 strategy" that staggers up to 3 courts one weekend then 2 courts then next weekend with a goal of converting all Pinal County LJ courts by the end of this calendar year. Adele indicated that efforts will then switch to Maricopa County ACAP courts along with Marana then Yavapai County LJ courts. She mentioned some features included in a new release of AJACS scheduled for November and reported on a follow-up conversation with Judge Hazel from Apache Junction Municipal Court based on a year and a half of AJACS use in the court. Adele detailed some documentation and training modifications made following post-implementation meetings in Pima and Pinal County courts that will improve outcomes for future implementations.

In response to a question, Adele outlined her approach to completing remaining counties following Yavapai by the end of 2019. A key is providing training on data cleanup to all courts regardless of timeline, even though some cleaned up cases may no longer be subject to conversion by the time the schedule reaches a specific court. Judges have stated that the increased time for conversion outweighs the risk of performing extra work. Adele also responded to questions about various remaining AJACS issues discussed in previous meetings. AOC has hired some dedicated financial analysts to help address the most common issues and provide a "go-to" resource for courts following conversion.

Due to a last-minute scheduling conflict for Paul Thomas, Stewart relayed information Paul provided him about the progress being made on Mesa's interfaces with CPOR and FARE. Paul is confident that both interfaces will be live by the end of November and promised a thorough update on and possible demonstration of both in the October CACC meeting.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

No implementations have taken place since the August CACC meeting.

ITEMS OF OLD OR NEW BUSINESS
No items of old or new business were discussed.

The next meeting will take place on **October 20, 2016 at 10:00 AM** at the State Courts Building in Phoenix.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.